



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*JA*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/777,246	12/31/96	OISHI	K 35.61868

005514 LM01/0107  
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK NY 10112-3801

EXAMINER

SONG, H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2766

*5*

DATE MAILED: 01/07/99

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**08/777,246**

Applicant(s)  
**Kazuomi Oishi**

Examiner  
**Ho S. Song**

Group Art Unit  
**2766**



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 31, 1996

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☒ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 6

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2766

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 250 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 250 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because abstract is not descriptive .

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-4,10-12,21,22, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by

Friedman(IEEE Vol.39).

4. In claims 1-2, Friedman teaches inputting first information which could be image file,

Private key is stored in the storage and Digital signature is generated based upon the first information and the secret key information in (figure 2, page 907).

Art Unit: 2766

Claim 10 is rejected based on claims 1-2.

As per claim 21, input means for image data and distinguishing data(i.e. the digital signature) has been discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Friedman also teaches verification means for using public key information to verify image data based on distinguishing data in (figure 6. Of page 909).

In claims 3,11, Friedman teaches generating a digital signature carries ou an operation and outputs digital signature in (figure 2 of page 907).

In claim 4 and 12,22, Friedman teaches public key cryptography operation in (page 905, third paragraph and figure 1 of page 906).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5-9,13-15,17-20,23,24,25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friedman.

Claims 6-7 differs from above claims 1-2 in that in claim 6 information is compressed by compressing means. The examiner asserts that it is well known in the art to compress data or information to have faster data transfer rate as well as not reducing the memory capacity.

Art Unit: 2766

In claims 5,9,13,17, Friedman does not teach using a RSA cryptosystem to obtain a digital signature. The examiner asserts that using RSA cryptosystem to obtain a digital signature is well known art because it's reliable and secure.

As per claim 14, Friedman teaches original message(image file) is inputted from first terminal the examiner asserts that there must be a terminal in order to process image data and second terminal device for having a memory for storing secret information and Friedman discloses an operator for executing a command based on an algorithm for generating a digital signature by using the image data and the secret information in (figure 2 of page 907). The examiner asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use this scheme because extra security for certification would be provided if two terminal would be used one for storing private key and other for inputting image data instead of having one terminal to perform whole operation.

As per claim 15, Friedman teaches public key cryptography operation in (page 5, third paragraph and figure 1 of page 906).

As per claims 18-20, see claims rejection 6-7 above, for discussion of compression techniques in general, further, the examiner asserts that applicant uses well known forms of compression techniques for video data. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to use one of these well known techniques for the advantages they possess.

In claim 23, Friedman discloses algorithm for encrypting information in (page 906, fig.1). It is obvious to encrypt a digital signature with second algorithm to provide extra security for

Art Unit: 2766

intended recipient. Friedman discloses algorithms and private key necessary for encrypting the digital signature file from within the camera are to be embedded inside a new breed of secure microprocessors whose ROM contents can not be observed outside of the factory. Because the private key used for encryption of information is hardcoded into this chip by the manufacturer, encryption can only perform by input device(page 908 last paragraph). Friedman also teaches that data it encrypts can be decrypted only by a designated receiving party(907 section on Measures of Protection). Thus means to limit decryption of either the digital signature or data to a particular device or person would have been obvious.

As per claim 24, see claim rejection 2 above.

As per claim 25, the examiner asserts that double encrypting data is well known in the art for the purpose of double securing valuable data from unknown attackers.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 22 recites the limitation "secret information" does not present in claim 21. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

8. Claims 11 recites the limitation "means for generating" does not present in claim 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

9. Claims 12-13 are rejected because of dependency.

Art Unit: 2766

*Claim Objections*

10. Claim 2 is objected to because it is not clear said information is first information or secret key information. Appropriate correction is required.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Ho S. Song at telephone number (703)305-0042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 a.m to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gail Hayes, can be reached at (703) 305-9711.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or preceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800. Fax number is (703) 305-9731.

  
GAIL O. HAYES  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 2700